



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,082	05/09/2001	Teruyasu Watabe	R2184.0079/P079-A	2774
24998	7590	06/29/2004	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526			PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2653	8	
DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/851,082	WATABE, TERUYASU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aristotelis M Psitos	2653

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/9/01.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2653

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response of 4/12/04 has been considered with the following results.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 4/12/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there would be no serious search burden to the Office. This is not found persuasive because contrary to applicants' assertion, there is a serious burden to the Office with respect to the search and the subsequent development of any arts discover. If applicants' are of the opinion that the claims as presented are patentable distinct then the examiner will re-evaluate the requirement.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 16-30 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/12/04.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 2653

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueki/Nagara et al either further considered with Kaku et al.

Either Ueki or Nagara et al disclose the APC ability in this environment. There is no "special" mode/power setting discussed.

Applicants' attention is drawn to either figures 9,11.15-23 in Ueki for depicting the system elements:

Laser driver (semiconductor), selectively outputted current driver, detection unit, and calculating unit.

Or alternatively, to figure 4 and its associated disclosure in Nagara et al for the detection and calculating unit. The examiner concludes that the semiconductor lasers and drivers are inherently present because the system as disclosed is for controlling the power levels of such elements during writing, and without such elements (lasers, current drivers) one could not achieve the stated result.

Kaku et al teaches the ability in this environment of recording test patterns and performing the appropriate evaluation and subsequent laser driver control as a result.

In Kaku et al see the description of figures 3 and 6 & 7.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of either Ueki or Nagara et al with the above additional teaching from Kaku et al; motivation is to permit both a APC and special pattern ability so as to set the laser accordingly. This permits better resultant C/N and rec/repr. abilities.

5. Claims 2-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the acknowledged prior art.

As discussed through out the specification, the acknowledged prior art discloses the erase, bias, and bottom level determination abilities in this environment, see the description of such circuitry detailed in the prior art at pages 31 and 32 of the present specification with respect to the bottom level ability for instance. The examiner concludes that figure 1 therein performs such as required by claims 12-15, the discussion with respect to the erase signal as well as the space power – as discussed for instance on pages 58 plus of the present specification, hence the limitations with respect to the space level (claims 8-11) and erase ability (claims 2-7) are considered present therein.

The examiner is endeavoring to obtain an English translation of this prior art to better identify the claimed elements for applicants' representative.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of references as stated above in paragraph 4 with the acknowledged prior art, motivation is to permit better laser diode control by compensating for various modes of operation.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miyamoto et al and Toda et al are also cited as illustrative of pc systems in this environment and could be used in the above rejections accordingly.

Hard copies of the application files are now separated from this examining corps; hence the examiner can answer no questions that require a review of the file without sufficient lead-time.

Any inquiries concerning missing papers/references, etc. must be directed to Group 2600 Customer Services at (703) 306-0377.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M Psitos whose telephone number is (703) 308-1598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday 8 - 4.

Art Unit: 2653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (703) 305-6137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aristotelis M Psitos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2653



AMP